

REMARKS/ARGUMENTS

After entry of the foregoing amendment, claims 1-18 and 22-27 will be pending in the application. No new matter has been added by the amendment.

In the Office Action, the Examiner rejected claims 19 and 21 under 35 U.S.C. §102(e) as being anticipated by U.S. Patent No. 6,340,928 B1 ("McCurdy"). The Examiner also rejected claim 20 under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) over McCurdy in view of U.S. Patent No. 5,388,147 ("Grimes"). Applicants respectfully traverse such rejection. Applicants have cancelled claims 19-21, the rejection of claims 19-21 is therefore mooted.

The Examiner also rejected claims 1-6, 13-16, 18, 22-23, and 25 under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) over U.S. Patent No. 5,805,670 ("Pons") in view of Grimes. Applicants respectfully traverse such rejection.

Pons discloses a private notification system for communicating 9-1-1 information. The Examiner admits in the Office Action that, in the system of Pons, a location signal is received from an ANI/ALI database and *not* from the subscriber's device as claimed. The location information derived from the ANI/ALI database is the caller's phone number and address where the phone with that phone number is located. *See* Pons at col. 5, ll. 55-65. Therefore, Pons merely teaches a system that includes an ANI/ALI controller for determining location information.

The Examiner relies on Grimes for teaching GPS functionality to determine the location of a caller using a wireless device. Applicant respectfully submits, however, that one skilled in the art would not be motivated to combine the teachings of Pons and Grimes to arrive at the claimed invention. Specifically, one skilled in the art would not be motivated to modify the system of Pons by adding functionality for determining a non-fixed location.

Unlike the claimed invention, the system of Pons is not a location system that may be used to determine a non-fixed location associated with a remote device. Pons merely determines a fixed location associated with an incoming phone number. Because there is a one-to-one correspondence between incoming phone number and location of the associated phone, Pons can store location information in an ANI/ALI database. There is, therefore, no need for the system of Pons to receive location signals from the remote device. Further, there is no teaching or suggestion in Pons, Grimes, or elsewhere in the cited art, that would motivate one skilled in the art to modify the system of Pons to receive location signals from the remote device in order to determine the device's location.

Consequently, a prima facie case of obviousness cannot be made and therefore the rejection of claims 1-6, 13-16, 18, 22-23, and 25 is improper. Applicants respectfully submit that independent claims 1 and 22 and all claims depending therefrom, including claims 2-18 and 23-26, are patentable over the cited art.

Further, newly added claim 27 is directed to "validating the contact data associated with each of a plurality of contacts." Applicants respectfully submit that none of the cited references teach or suggest validating the contact data associated with each of a plurality of contacts. For this reason as well, Applicants respectfully submit that claim 27 patentably defines over the teachings of the cited references.

CONCLUSION

In view of the foregoing remarks, Applicant respectfully submits that the present application, including claims 1-18 and 22-27, is in condition for allowance. Reconsideration of the application and an early Notice of Allowance are respectfully requested. In the event that the Examiner believes that the present application is not allowable for any reason, the

DOCKET NO.: BELL 0128/01181
Application No.: 09/965,984
Office Action Dated: Feb. 11, 2003

PATENT

Examiner is encouraged to contact the undersigned attorney to discuss resolution of any remaining issues.

Date:

6/10/03



Etich M. Falke
Registration No. 49,049

Woodcock Washburn LLP
One Liberty Place - 46th Floor
Philadelphia PA 19103
Telephone: (215) 568-3100
Facsimile: (215) 568-3439